

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the courteous and complete examination of the application by the Examiner. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, a reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Regarding the drawing objection

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims, specifically the central web of claim 2. A replacement drawing sheet is submitted which includes element reference label 46 indicating the central web. Support of which is found in paragraph [0042] of the original disclosure.

Regarding the specification objections

The Examiner objected to the abstract because of informalities. A replacement abstract section is submitted which changes the word “plastics” with “plastic”.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of informalities. Paragraph [0002] has been replaced with a replacement paragraph which inserts the word “arrangements” between the phrase “typical are”. Paragraph [0009] has been replaced with a replacement paragraph which inserts the word “and” between the phrase “plug the”. Additionally, paragraph [0014] has been replaced with a replacement paragraph which inserts a comma between the phrase “consequence application”. The Examiner also objected to paragraph [0014] in that the word “a” should be removed in the phrase “screw a may”. The Applicant respectfully believes that the Examiner is in error. The phrase “screw a may” is not found on page 3, line 6, or any where else in the disclosure. The phrase “screw it may” was found on page 3, line 6 (paragraph [0014]), but this phrase is believed to be proper and correct.

Regarding the claim objections

The Examiner objected to claim 4 because of informalities. Claim 4 has been amended to change the phrase “short plug the expander” to read as “short plug and the expander”. Additionally, the Examiner objected to claim 12 because of informalities.

Claim 12 has been amended so as to be only one sentence. Lastly, the Examiner objected to claim 15 as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. Claim 15 has been amended to remove the multiple dependent language.

Regarding the claim 112 rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention. Claim 5 has been amended to change the phrase “connecting member” to read as “connecting member expander”, and the limitation “long” has been changed to “an elongated”.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected claim 4. Claim 4 has been amended to remove the limitation “short”.

Regarding the claim 102 rejections

The Applicant appreciates the time and effort the Examiner has made in locating the prior art relied upon in the above-identified office action.

In order to expedite the prosecution of this application, claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. Claims 1-9 and 11-16 have been amended to correct all informalities and to overcome all objections and rejections. Claims 1-9 and 11-16 are now in this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alley (US 6,536,166), claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lafevre (US 5,560,149) and Gold (US 4,949,509), and claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bishop (GB 2291687) in view of Etten (US 2,879,840). The Examiner states that claims 6 and 10 would be allowable over the prior art of record if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent claims 1, 14 and 16 have been amended to contain the allowable subject matters of cancelled claim 10. Claim 16 was also amended to include all of the structural limitations of amended claim 1. It can therefore be appreciated that amended

independent claims 1, 14 and 16 are believed to be in condition for allowance since they include the allowable subject matter of cancelled claim 10.

Claims 2-9 and 11-13 are felt to patentably distinguish over the prior art references because of their above-mentioned dependency from amended claim 1. Claim 15 is felt to patentably distinguish over the prior art reference because of its above-mentioned dependency from amended claim 14.

With the above amendments being fully responsive to all outstanding rejections and formal requirements, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that there are further issues which might be resolved by means of telephone interview, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (403) 444-5695, or email at davidguerra@internationalpatentgroup.com

A one month extension of time fee of \$60.00 is provided.

Respectfully Submitted,

/David A. Guerra/

David A. Guerra, Reg. 46,443

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, electronically transmitted using EFS-Web, or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

On (Date) 12/17/2007 by David A. Guerra /David A. Guerra/